

REMARKS

Claims 1-42 are pending.

Claims 1-42 stand rejected.

Rejection Based Upon 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 2, 7, 10-18, 21-23, 28, 31-39, and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,706,286 (Reiman et al.). Applicant notes that Reiman qualifies as a prior art reference under § 102(e), not § 102(b). Regardless, Reiman does not anticipate claims 1-42 for the following reasons.

A typical call includes signaling (such as SS7 signaling) and communications (such voice communications). Independent claims 1 and 22 recite an interworking unit configured to receive signaling and communications for a call and convert the communications between a first format and a second format. Reiman does not disclose an interworking unit that receives communications for a call and converts the communications from a first format to a second format. Rather, Reiman discloses a system to convert signaling from a first protocol to a second protocol, not a system that converts call communications (Reiman, abstract).

Reiman discloses intelligent services network (ISN) nodes 14 with gateways 18 for SS7 signaling conversion, but not to receive or convert communications for a call as required by claims 1 and 22 (Reiman, col. 6, lines 10-15). Specifically, gateways 18 receive queries from the PSTN and reformat the queries into a format the ISN nodes 14 can use, but the gateways do not convert call communications (Reiman, col. 17, lines 25-30). Fig. 4 depicts a TCAP API 54 and APP API 56 that form an SS7 interface to the gateways, but does not depict any interface for converting communications (Reiman, col. 17, lines 60-67).

Dependent claims 2, 7, 10-18, 21, 23, 28, 31-39, and 42 each recite further limitations that render these claims separately patentable over the prior art. However, because the limitations of base claims 1 and 22 are sufficient to distinguish Reiman, a discussion regarding the dependent claims is unnecessary.

Rejection Based Upon 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 3-6, 8, 9, 19, 20, 24-27, 29, 30, 40, and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Reiman in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,935,209 (Budhraj et al.). While claims 3-6, 8, 9, 19, 20, 24-27, 29, 30, 40, and 41 each recite further limitations that render these separately patentable over the prior art, a discussion is not necessary because the limitations of base claims 1 and 22 are sufficient to distinguish Reiman in view of Budhraj.

CONCLUSION

Applicant requests an Advisory Action as this response is being filed within two months of the final rejection under MPEP 706.07(f)(D). The claims in their present form are allowable over the art of record. Applicant therefore solicits their allowance. However, if it is determined that additional fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to debit our Deposit Account No. 21-0765 for the required fees.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 05-29-03



Stephen S. Roche, Reg. No. 52,176

Tel. No.: 303-546-1300

Fax No.: 303-499-5426

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Customer No.: 028004